

DAYLIGHT

Creation Science for Catholics

Number 4

Summer 1992

Contents

Details of "DAYLIGHT"	2
Editorial	3
"Spotlight" - on recent news	4
"Do Spirits Exist ?", by Fr.Guy Gibbins	5
"Spectrum" - extracts from your letters	9
Scientific disciplines established by Creationists ..	10
Inventions and discoveries by Creationists	11
"Church Arian, Church Evolutionist" - J.G.Campbell..	12
"Can Science do without Truth ?" - Dominique Tassot, (Tr. Ann Hansford) ..	15
"Catholic Teaching on Evolution" - from the encyclical "Humani Generis", Pope Pius XII	20

---ooOoo---

Editor: A.L.G.Nevard B.Sc.

Address: 19 Francis Avenue, St.Albans,
Herts AL3 6BL, ENGLAND.

---ooOoo---

STATEMENT OF POSITION

'DAYLIGHT' is a non-profit educational initiative, funded by subscriptions and donations, set up in response to the need for a specifically Catholic creation-science society. While recognising the valuable contribution made by Protestant scientists and groups, as Catholics we are not limited by the principles of Fundamentalism, "Sola Scriptura", or private interpretation of the Bible. We accept Christ's Church as the final authority on the true sense of the Scriptures. Therefore it is editorial policy not to publish views which attack Catholic dogma. Apart from this, the organisation, finances and editorship of 'DAYLIGHT' are independent of any other secular or religious group.

AIMS

- (1) To inform Catholics about the scientific evidence that supports belief in Special Creation as opposed to Evolution.
- (2) To demonstrate that the traditional Catholic doctrines related to Origins are in conformity with the discoveries of Science.
- (3) To encourage research, discussion and education in scientific issues related to the biblical, doctrinal, historical and moral teachings of the Catholic Church.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

Payment for 4 issues is due annually in **September**.
UK & Ireland £5 . **Europe** £7.
Outside Europe (by Air) £10 or US\$20 ; (surface) £7.

Please pay in ££ Sterling or US Dollar bills.
Please make cheques payable to "DAYLIGHT".

Hon. Secretary & Editor : Anthony Nevard B.Sc.

EDITORIAL

As some readers will recall, the original **Daylight** was edited by the late **John Campbell** from 1977-1983, and many good articles were written by him. "**Church Arian, Church Evolutionist**" was one of his most trenchant pieces, and we are pleased to respond to a request to reprint it in this issue; it is as apt now as when written about 12 years ago.

'**Do Spirits Exist ?**' is one of a set of essays by a retired priest from Sussex, **Fr. Guy Gibbins**. The denial of the existence of the soul is a consequence of the materialistic theory of evolution, as is the rejection of the principle of causation; both are essential for the acceptance of belief in the existence of a Supernatural Supreme Cause. As Professor of Philosophy Dr. William Marra has stressed, the essence of the evolution/creation debate is not a contest between scientific facts, but a difference of philosophies. Evolutionism, by claiming to be science, can invoke only observable and testable material causes; hence 'theistic evolution' is invalidated as unscientific. As natural causes have failed to account for the supposed transformism, the process invoked has become 'no cause' i.e. random chance, to replace the rational conclusion of an omnipotent Final Cause. Hence the intense research in recent years into any natural event that appears to create order from disorder, such as quantum mechanics, fractals, chaos theory and 'punctuated equilibria'. An expert article on this subject is invited!

'**Science et Foi**' is the quarterly magazine of CESHE, running to some 50 pages in French, some of it quite technical, sometimes including Hebrew, Greek, Coptic, even hieroglyphics ! It is not our intention to take on its wholesale translation, but just a few selected articles to indicate the tenor of the periodical. The article chosen for this issue was the Editorial of No.14, 1989, by the Editor and President of CESHE FRANCE, **Dominique Tassot**. We thank **Ann Hansford** for her work of translating and typing it.

Anthony Nevard.

SPOTLIGHT

The 1991 Royal Institution Christmas Lectures.

Several people (not all creationists) told me of their disappointment at the anti-Christian prejudices of the speaker, Dr. Richard Dawkins, especially contrasting his attitude unfavourably with that of the founder of the lectures, **Michael Faraday**, whose science was based on Christian principles. Space does not permit further elaboration here, but well-argued critiques of Dawkins' lectures may be obtained from :

Biblical Creation Society, P.O.Box 22, Rugby, CV22 7SY.
Creation Resources Trust, Mead Farm, Downhead, West Camel, Yeovil, Somerset BA22 7RQ.

Naturalistic evolutionists a fringe element in USA !

According to results of a Gallup Poll released on Nov.28 1991, only 9% of all Americans hold to naturalistic evolution. Another 40% believe in God-directed evolution, but 47% believe in special, recent creation of man by God. This has been achieved despite relentless evolutionary indoctrination in the public schools, colleges and universities, thanks to the intensive educational work of creationist scientists; sadly very few of these are Catholics. Could this be a reason why so many Catholics are converting to Evangelical Protestantism ? They take the Bible seriously as the true Word of God.

'Evolution- Fact or Belief?' approved in Rome.

The Vatican journal "Christ to the World", Jan-Feb issue, 1992, published a letter from CESHE including the following encouraging news:

"Earlier this year we were invited by **Cardinal Ratzinger** to show him the video film. Also present were **Archbishop Bovone**, **Msgr. Josef Clemens**, and a Jesuit advisor, **Fr. Marcozzi**. It was received very favourably. The Cardinal remarked upon the importance of the statement by the Polish scientist in the film that **Evolution was a philosophy and not a science.**"

Perhaps more of us should be inviting our local priests and hierarchy to view the film ? Can we do more ?

DO SPIRITS EXIST ?

Fr.Guy Gibbins

"Today there are many people who find it easier to believe in Satanic than in angelic manifestations, in ghosts than in the Holy Ghost, in poltergeists than in God. THE FIRST STEP IN THE CONVERSION OF THE MUDDLED MODERN MIND IS TO PROVE THAT A SPIRIT WORLD EXISTS."

'The Revolt against Reason', by Sir Arnold Lunn. p.165.

Most people have always taken it for granted that Spirits exist. But such is the power of atheism today that even in Church one seldom or never hears any clear and definite belief expressed either in the human spirit, in a real God, distinct from the Universe, Creator of Heaven and earth, in Angels, the Saints in Heaven, or indeed any definite teaching about life after death, in Heaven or in Hell.

Therefore, as C.S.Lewis pointed out in his excellent book: 'Miracles', "Plain men are being forced to bear burdens which plain men were never expected to bear before. We must get the truth for ourselves or go without it."

All the time we are awake we are feeling, thinking, deciding, and acting. Also everyone, or almost everyone, is convinced that some thoughts and actions are good and others evil. [I write 'almost everyone' because it is an undecided point as to whether some people can be persuaded, or can force themselves to believe, that there is no difference between right and wrong; that right and wrong are words without meaning.] Each one of us is conscious of an 'I', a self. "Nothing is more evident than that we possess a direct and immediate knowledge, not merely of thoughts, volitions and emotions, BUT OF A SUBJECT WHICH THINKS, WILLS AND FEELS." Fr.G.H.Joyce S.J., 'Principles of Natural Theology', p.25. People have always taken it for granted that this 'I' which thinks, wills and feels is a soul, that is a spirit; ('soul' is the word used for a spirit joined to a body, as the human spirit is during this present life) and that this spirit is not the

brain, or any part of it, but that it is separate from the brain and makes use of it. By brain I mean the material substance inside the skull which can be touched and seen, and indeed cut up and examined under a microscope.

But since about 300 years ago, when modern science began, so much attention has been paid to the material world that today many people think that nothing else exists. If that were true, we human beings would be entirely material, just bodies and brains. Atheists say that consciousness is part of the brain. They assert this although no one has been able to explain how a material thing like the brain could be conscious. The brain is just a computer, and can work on its own unconsciously, just like a man-made computer. One must be quite clear at this point. When we are conscious it is not our BRAIN which is conscious, but our soul. But have you ever taken the trouble to notice how many things our brain does for us unconsciously thus saving our souls a great deal of time and effort? An example is handwriting. As a child you were taught to form each letter consciously and with difficulty. But now you have only to think what you want to write down and your hand, guided unconsciously by your brain, does the rest automatically. Our brain-computer even does things for us which we cannot do satisfactorily by consciously telling the brain what movements to get the body to make. Anyone who rides a bicycle can probably remember learning to ride, and how he or she had to keep putting a foot to the ground, because one could not make balancing movements quickly enough by thinking about them and telling the brain what to do. After a time one found that one was balancing automatically and without any effort. The brain-computer had become programmed how to do it.

But though the brain is cleverer than any man-made computer, it does have its limits. It can only do what it has been programmed to do and needs an over-all guidance from the soul, otherwise it is liable to make mistakes, sometimes quite absurd ones. People who frequently make such mistakes are called 'absent-minded'. This expression shows a distinction between the mind (i.e.soul) and the brain. But the word 'mind' is sometimes used for the brain

itself, which is confusing. If consciousness were the brain or part of it, our feelings, thoughts, decisions etc. WOULD JUST BE THE RESULT OF THE STATE OF OUR BRAIN AT THAT MOMENT. We could not know if they corresponded to any outside reality. Atheists admit this. For example, a Victorian scientist, Professor T.H.Huxley, said that consciousness "bears the same ineffectual reality to the activity of the brain as a steam-whistle bears to the activity of a locomotive." Another scientist, Professor Haldane, said: "If my mental processes are determined wholly by the motions of atoms in my brain, I have no reason to suppose that my beliefs are true." Mr.Wilfred Beckerman, described as a Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, wrote along the same lines in "The Problem of Judging Evil", in "The Times" of 17.12.'86. Such statements by atheists are legion. They are examples of how atheism refutes itself. Because atheists say that our conscious thought is not real and then use it to say that it is not real - an absurd contradiction !

But can we actually prove that, besides material things, spirit also exists ? I have just pointed out that atheism contradicts itself, and that we have a direct knowledge of our soul. But the difficulty about the soul is that though we have a direct knowledge of it, we cannot see it, touch it, or get any idea of what a spirit is like. That is because the soul and body being joined, the soul has to make use of the brain which, being a material thing, can only make material things known to the soul - things that can be seen, heard, touched, smelled or tasted. So it is much easier for us to believe in such things and think we know all about them. In fact (but this is a philosophical question), in spite of modern microscopes, we cannot know what material things really are, but though we can only know things which are not material by taking material things and REASONING from them, we do in fact know these immaterial things (like our own souls) much more securely. How often scientists, studying material things, change their minds ! Here is an example of how we know immaterial things by our reason. Suppose the electric light in my room goes out. I try another bulb and find that the light is restored. The

bulbs and my hand, which takes one out and puts another in, are of course material things. But I try another bulb because my reason tells me that every happening (including, of course, the failure of the light) must have a cause. Causation is not a material thing, but it is real. It doesn't need proof. Though our human ability to know is very limited, there are some simple aspects of reality we can really know; we see that they absolutely must be as they are. They are part of Truth itself. They obviously don't depend on the state of someone's brain, mine or anyone else's. They must be true for everyone, at all times and in all places. Atheists cannot admit this because, for example, the realisation that every event must have a cause leads directly to a certainty that a Supreme Spirit, God, must exist. Another of these 'general principles of knowledge' is that the whole (e.g. cake) is greater than the part, and mathematical truths. Because atheists know such self-evident truths prove the existence of God, they try to make out that we don't really know these first principles of knowledge, but our brains simply associate one thing with another, e.g. a glass bulb with electric light, or our experience that a cake diminishes in size as slices are removed. Or that we may expect fire when we see smoke, not because we understand how fire CAUSES smoke, but because we have learnt by experience that 'where there's smoke, there's fire '. So just as atheists deny their own direct knowledge of their souls, so they try to deny the reality of other spiritual things. Such things as love, hate, justice, courage, fear, beauty, good and evil. These things are real, but obviously not material.

Notice that the soul does not only feel, think and decide, and know good from evil, but that it makes use of the brain to move the body and so make changes in the world round about us. There is a common belief today that science has made belief in miracles impossible. If we realise that we have souls we should not find it difficult to believe in miracles. If we ourselves can make changes in the world, surely God, the Supreme Spirit, can when He chooses make the direct changes we call miracles, though He usually acts by way of the natural laws which He has created. In the early part of this century, when there was

a drought, there would be prayers for rain, in Church. This custom seems to have ceased because so many people no longer believe in miracles. Sir Oliver Lodge, a scientist who was not an atheist, said that it was no more unreasonable to ask God to send rain, than to ask the gardener to water the garden. The reader may retort that I have not proved the existence of a Supreme Spirit. That proof must wait for another chapter. But it is a fact that when people believe in the existence of the human spirit they have no difficulty about believing in God.

I will end this by summing up what I have already written. If we think things out clearly, which atheists seldom do, we shall realise not only that atheism is self-contradictory but that it denies that there is any meaning in life. Our whole being rejects this dreadful conclusion. But once accept, as even atheists are forced to do in practice, in their daily lives, that the human soul is a reality which is not part of the brain, and we are ready to begin the study of the Catholic Faith which can be summed up in the words of the "Penny Catechism" - "God made me to know Him, love Him, and serve Him in this life, and to be happy with Him for ever in the next."

ooo+++ooo

"SPECTRUM"

A range of opinions from readers' letters.

"Best wishes and God's help with the venture. I think it's marvellous." J.T.

"Seeing your address was like a call from the Catholic Church which may have some special meaning for me...how I welcome a stand such as you have taken." T.C.

"Thanks for the material; always very interesting." M.C.

"I would like to congratulate you on the excellent work you are doing and thank you for the newsletters which I found most interesting." Dr.D.O. (Australia).

"..send me a further five copies of the newsletter."J.C.

TABLE I
SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINES ESTABLISHED
BY CREATIONIST SCIENTISTS

DISCIPLINE	SCIENTIST
ANTISEPTIC SURGERY	JOSEPH LISTER (1827-1912)
BACTERIOLOGY	LOUIS PASTEUR (1822-1895)
CALCULUS	ISAAC NEWTON (1642-1727)
CELESTIAL MECHANICS	JOHANN KEPLER (1571-1630)
CHEMISTRY	ROBERT BOYLE (1627-1691)
COMPARATIVE ANATOMY	GEORGES CUVIER (1769-1832)
COMPUTER SCIENCE	CHARLES BABBAGE (1792-1871)
DIMENSIONAL ANALYSIS	LORD RAYLEIGH (1842-1919)
DYNAMICS	ISAAC NEWTON (1642-1727)
ELECTRONICS	JOHN AMBROSE FLEMING (1849-1945)
ELECTRODYNAMICS	JAMES CLERK MAXWELL (1831-1879)
ELECTRO-MAGNETICS	MICHAEL FARADAY (1791-1867)
ENERGETICS	LORD KELVIN (1824-1907)
ENTOMOLOGY OF LIVING INSECTS	HENRI FABRE (1823-1915)
FIELD THEORY	MICHAEL FARADAY (1791-1867)
FLUID MECHANICS	GEORGE STOKES (1819-1903)
GALACTIC ASTRONOMY	WILLIAM HERSCHEL (1738-1822)
GAS DYNAMICS	ROBERT BOYLE (1627-1691)
GENETICS	GREGOR MENDEL (1822-1884)
GLACIAL GEOLOGY	LOUIS AGASSIZ (1807-1873)
GYNECOLOGY	JAMES SIMPSON (1811-1870)
HYDRAULICS	LEONARDO DA VINCI (1452-1519)
HYDROGRAPHY	MATTHEW MAURY (1806-1873)
HYDROSTATICS	BLAISE PASCAL (1623-1662)
ICHTHYOLOGY	LOUIS AGASSIZ (1807-1873)
ISOTOPIC CHEMISTRY	WILLIAM RAMSAY (1852-1916)
MODEL ANALYSIS	LORD RAYLEIGH (1842-1919)
NATURAL HISTORY	JOHN RAY (1627-1705)
NON-EUCLIDEAN GEOMETRY	BERNHARD RIEMANN (1826-1866)
OCEANOGRAPHY	MATTHEW MAURY (1806-1873)
OPTICAL MINERALOGY	DAVID BREWSTER (1781-1868)
PALEONTOLOGY	JOHN WOODWARD (1665-1728)
PATHOLOGY	RUDOLPH VIRCHOW (1821-1902)
PHYSICAL ASTRONOMY	JOHANN KEPLER (1571-1630)
REVERSIBLE THERMODYNAMICS	JAMES JOULE (1818-1889)
STATISTICAL THERMODYNAMICS	JAMES CLERK MAXWELL (1831-1879)
STRATIGRAPHY	NICHOLAS STENO (1631-1686)
SYSTEMATIC BIOLOGY	CAROLUS LINNAEUS (1707-1778)
THERMODYNAMICS	LORD KELVIN (1824-1907)
THERMOKINETICS	HUMPHREY DAVY (1778-1829)
VERTEBRATE PALEONTOLOGY	GEORGES CUVIER (1769-1832)

TABLE II
NOTABLE INVENTIONS, DISCOVERIES
OR DEVELOPMENTS BY CREATIONIST SCIENTISTS

CONTRIBUTION	SCIENTIST
ABSOLUTE TEMPERATURE SCALE	LORD KELVIN (1824-1907)
ACTUARIAL TABLES	CHARLES BABBAGE (1792-1871)
BAROMETER	BLAISE PASCAL (1623-1662)
BIOGENESIS LAW	LOUIS PASTEUR (1822-1895)
CALCULATING MACHINE	CHARLES BABBAGE (1792-1871)
CHLOROFORM	JAMES SIMPSON (1811-1870)
CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM	CAROLUS LINNAEUS (1707-1778)
DOUBLE STARS	WILLIAM HERSCHEL (1738-1822)
ELECTRIC GENERATOR	MICHAEL FARADAY (1791-1867)
ELECTRIC MOTOR	JOSEPH HENRY (1797-1878)
EPHEMERIS TABLES	JOHANN KEPLER (1571-1630)
FERMENTATION CONTROL	LOUIS PASTEUR (1822-1895)
GALVANOMETER	JOSEPH HENRY (1797-1878)
GLOBAL STAR CATALOG	JOHN HERSCHEL (1792-1871)
INERT GASES	WILLIAM RAMSAY (1852-1916)
KALEIDOSCOPE	DAVID BREWSTER (1781-1868)
LAW OF GRAVITY	ISAAC NEWTON (1642-1727)
MINE SAFETY LAMP	HUMPHREY DAVY (1778-1829)
PASTEURIZATION	LOUIS PASTEUR (1822-1895)
REFLECTING TELESCOPE	ISAAC NEWTON (1642-1727)
SCIENTIFIC METHOD	FRANCIS BACON (1561-1626)
SELF-INDUCTION	JOSEPH HENRY (1797-1878)
TELEGRAPH	SAMUEL F.B. MORSE (1791-1872)
THERMIONIC VALVE	AMBROSE FLEMING (1849-1945)
TRANS-ATLANTIC CABLE	LORD KELVIN (1824-1907)
VACCINATION & IMMUNIZATION	LOUIS PASTEUR (1822-1895)

The above Tables reproduced by kind permission of
Dr. Henry Morris. First published in "Impact", Jan. 1982.

"Acts and Facts" (news items), and "Impact"
(scientific articles) can be obtained FREE from :
INSTITUTE FOR CREATION RESEARCH, P.O. Box 2667,
El Cajon, California 92021, U.S.A.

CHURCH ARIAN, CHURCH EVOLUTIONIST

John G. Campbell

"The Church wakened to find itself Arian", as St. Jerome put it. Today the Church has wakened to find itself Evolutionist. And today's heresy- or body of heresies- is a much more radical thing than the adherence to the single Arian heresy; for the present error, though it is presented as Theistic Evolution, draws upon the fundamental atheistic or pantheistic explanation of the universe: the universe creating itself by its own processes. Quite obviously it is a most radical departure, to throw overboard the Church's teaching, from the very beginning, on direct creation by God. Quite obviously it is a most dangerous departure; for we witness the theologians, trying to accommodate themselves to the Evolutionist thesis, now proposing the elimination of Adam (polygenism) and of Original Sin, thereby transforming the Faith into a purely naturalistic explanation of things.

Like all other currents of thought within the Church, this business originated in the seminaries, a fact which is well corroborated by various clerical correspondents of the present writer. An aged priest in Britain affirms that Evolution was presented to him in his seminary prior to the First World War. An American friar in his late fifties, states that he was regarded as something of an oddity when he declared to his Professor and fellow students that Evolution was far from being proved. A young priest recounts that his Professor presented polygenism as the most probable explanation of man. Indeed, these examples are themselves corroborated by the fact that most of the young seminarians emerging today are Evolutionist and Teilhardian in their outlook. There can be little doubt that the evil is long-standing and deep-rooted.

The example of the polygenetic professor is an illuminating one. The legend was that the seminaries were arenas of the most acute philosophical and theological debate, but here is an academic prepared to

accept the idea that man evolved everywhere, but all evolved in precisely the same type, down to the same ten fingers and ten toes, and all imbued with the idea that they were all members of the one human race. An idea so contrary to all human experience as this is obediently accepted upon the authority of "the scientists". And here is the root error, that of Scientism; that theology and philosophy must find their bases upon the dicta of "the scientists". It is a complete surrender, and a reversal of all previous teaching.

One aspect of this Evolutionist teaching must be emphasised. The young seminarian is presented, not only with Evolutionism, but with a theology based upon Evolutionism, Evolutionist Theology, and thus, sooner or later, Evolution begins to be regarded almost as one of the sacred theological truths. So that today we may witness the spectacle of a young cleric being astonished upon hearing Evolution being described as a myth—as if one of the truths of Religion were being challenged !

But what is the most astonishing and serious aspect of this situation is this: that few, if any, of the clerics seem to have heard of the authorities who have presented the case against Evolution. It may be that some have heard of the modern American attack upon the theory, and have blandly dismissed it as simply being another manifestation of "Fundamentalism". However, the root of the matter is elsewhere. There has been all along a classic line of European authorities against Evolution, instancing Lord Kelvin and Sir Ambrose Fleming, Vialleton, Lemoine and Thomas in France, plus eminent Italian authorities [e.g. Carrazzi, Fano and now Sermoniti and Fondi -Ed.] and this to name but a few. It is probably true that, owing to the great suppression in the modern media, most ordinary men have not heard of such authorities, but the librarians and faculty members of these seats of learning are not ordinary men, and it is difficult to conceive of them being unaware of the published works of these scientists, particularly those of Paris publication.

The truth of the matter seems to be in the warnings of St. Pius X in his **Pascendi** [Papal encyclical, 1907 - Ed.] of the persistent infiltrations of the Modernists towards seizing the keys of power within the Church. As St. Pius declared: **"They seize upon professorships in the seminaries and universities, and gradually make of them chairs of pestilence."** No warning could be more explicit. One can only conclude that, since the days of St. Pius the seizure of the seminaries has continued with increased pertinacity; so that today we are the witnesses of an unprecedented takeover. And please remember that it was this same Pope who penetratingly pointed out, re the Modernists, **"In this way they pass to what is practically their principal doctrine, namely, evolution."**

Indeed, such is the state of affairs that one encounters young clerics who have never heard of the deliberate forgeries of Evolution (with the possible exception of Piltdown), this to their great embarrassment when shown the proofs. Thus the great take-over seems to amount to no less than a suppression of quite commonly known facts, so as not to disturb the bases of such theologies as those of Teilhard de Chardin and his followers. The seminaries remain steeped in darkest Darwinian ignorance. [With the exception of a number of Traditional Catholic seminaries of recent foundation - Ed.]

It may be that there are seminaries in certain areas which have avoided the Evolutionist "pestilence", but the samples taken by the present writer, plus his other encounters, would seem to indicate that the rot is very widespread indeed. [Especially including teacher-training, catechetical establishments and school R.E. Depts - Ed.] Clearly, that which is urgently required is for the Evolutionist Professors to be challenged - Have you any clear evidence that this Evolution, on which you base your theology, is attested in the nature of things? And they should be required to answer those eminent authorities who declare that Evolution is contrary to the facts of their respective sciences.

Meanwhile, let any of the young clerics who have heard some whispers of the truth read up for themselves the exposures of the hoaxes and basic falsehood of Evolution. After all, there can surely be no bar against them verifying the rightness of consistent Church teaching.

CAN SCIENCE DO WITHOUT TRUTH?

By Dominique Tassot

Without making a categorical pronouncement, contemporary science has stopped looking for the truth. By renouncing final causes, all forms of causality have been removed. So what is left...? There remain "models" and "everything happens as if" we also have the "effects" in short, fictitious explanations to account for phenomena without having reflected on their real nature.

Why renounce getting to the bottom of things in this way when the metaphysical tradition of the West maintains that Man can know reality? especially when the positivist pretensions of the last century made human science the source and rule of total certainty....? This question is essential for the believer, because faith is an affirmation of intelligence (*) and by conceding that intelligence is incapable of achieving reality, one inevitably concludes that faith is a subjective belief founded only on feeling. This becomes another religion and the controversies of exegesis, liturgy or catechism are simply the embodiments of this fundamental dilemma.

A first answer impresses itself immediately: for about two centuries the learned have ceased to also be philosophers. They became specialists, often cultivating only one subject, they lost sight of the necessary coherence of all truth and of all the orders of truth. Closed to the metaphysical and having decided to consider only what is visible, little by little they contented themselves in achieving new technical skills

(*) Faith - in Hebrew 'Emouna' is a confirmation of truth. (say 'Amen') The word carries and etymological root signifying mental agreement with a concept of truth.

without attempting to get to the bottom of the many implications of their own work.

Practical success ended up taking the place of truth and little by little, science reduced itself to technology. This simplification is admission of theoretical weakness and it provides the second answer to our question.

The great advances which changed the life of humanity; electricity, radio, hydraulics, cars, aeroplanes etc... These advances are founded on the theoretical discernments of the nineteenth century. The technological developments which followed were refined without developing our knowledge of the forces of nature.

This brutal end to theoretical knowledge cannot fail to surprise us. The preceding centuries were all marked by major advances in scientific thinking: Consider the simple bodies of Lavoissier, the laws of motion, optics, mathematics etc...

Truth seemed to be progressively unveiling itself and suddenly the sciences that were known as "exact" came under a barrage of attack. What barrage?... It seems to us to be made up of false conceptions that were not subjected the proper debating process when "polemic proofs" showed up the inadequacy of the theories.

The case of the Michealson-Morely experiment is typical: instead of asking himself about the validity of heliocentrism, he ended up embarking on a theory that was made to measure. Making the rule out of the paradox. Einstein's theory of relativity is the prototype of those aerial constructions which rebel at every contact with reality and which Maurice Allais very prettily described as "mathematical quackery".

Indeed, a theory based on false reasoning cannot be true. This contradiction of logic is visible in the syllogism made by Einstein:

1. The earth is moving around the sun.
2. This movement cannot be proved by Michealson-Morley's interferometer
3. So the speed of light does not alter with the speed the observer and no absolute movement can be given prominence.

It immediately appears that the premise and conclusion are contradictory. In fact the supposed proof of the earth's movement around the sun, Bradley's aberration (1727) comes from a calculation combining the speed of light with that of the earth. The problem becomes the following.

A. Either the ether exists (hypothesis which realises the phenomena of interference).

A.1 Or The ether is pulled by the earth. In which case, there is no composition of the two speeds and Bradley's theory does not hold up.

A.2 Or The ether is not pulled by the earth. So Airy's experiment (*) should have modified the angle of aberration, which had not been observed.

B. Or The ether does not exist (Einstein).

(*) In 1871, Airy (1801-1892) Royal Greenwich astronomer, had measured the aberration with a telescope filled with water. The angle of the aberration should have increased (because light slows down in water) in proportion to the refractive indices of water and air.

So there is no composition of the two speeds and Bradley's interpretation does not hold up.

It is immediately evident that Bradley's interpretation (according to which the aberration proves the annual movement of the earth) does not maintain itself in any figure-case. Einstein's reasoning is thus characterised by a beginning with no justification and a conclusion contrary to the beginning.

With such a starting point one easily understands that it results in paradoxes such as the dilation of time or the contraction of length.

Far be it for us to pretend that it was easy for Michealson's colleagues to challenge heliocentrism. The old hypothesis had a hard life, challenges are painful and the man of science is more likely to burn other people's idols than his own.

Instead of thoroughly going into the problematic issue of Michealson's experiments, the physicists ended up, half a century later, by accepting to live in the paradox and contradiction. It was an admission that truth was not important. It was, in claiming to do without the truth, a form of sin against the spirit.

(*) Einstein himself was never persuaded of the truth of his theory. He marginalised himself among physicists because he persisted to look for the cause of the universe, but he was well aware of not having found, according to his own terms, "The real Jacob". He later wrote to a friend: "you imagine that I look on my life's work with a calm satisfaction. But, seen close up it is nothing. There is not a single concept which I am convinced will stand the test of time. And I wonder if I am on the right track.

Today we can see the scientific and social consequences of that abdication of intelligence. At the same time we can also see how to reinstate science to its former fruitfulness by reinstating truth to a position of honour.

Truth is also a person. It is even the corner stone of all human endeavour. The builders rejected it by refusing the geocentric perspective and therefore the Christocentric which was looming behind Michealson's interferometer. Why did they stumble over the stone? They stumble, St Peter tells us, "because they do not believe in the word" (1 Peter 2,8). We are not therefore surprised at the crumbling of modern science's castles in the air. But we hope that Christ will be quickly reinstated to his own place at the pinnacle of human knowledge.

Translated by Ann Hansford

Comments.

This article raises doubts about several ideas that many people believe are proved scientific facts.

(1) The constancy of the speed of light.

(2) The absence of an 'ether' occupying space in the universe;

(3) That the Earth revolves around a fixed Sun (Heliocentrism).

Not only are these claims interconnected, but on their validity depend Einstein's Theory of Relativity, the estimations of the size and age of the Universe, and hence the Theory of Evolution. In addition, the possibility emerges that Galileo's science was wrong, and the Catholic Church was right ! Hardly surprising, then, that many scientists in CESHE consider the issue of great importance.

I have yet to read a well-informed, balanced, fair and objective treatment of this fascinating but rather difficult subject. Expert help would be welcome ! Ed.

CATHOLIC TEACHING ON EVOLUTION

The last major pronouncement by the teaching Magisterium of the Church was **Pope Pius XII's Encyclical 'Humani Generis'** in 1950, which reiterated the doctrinal teaching of past Church Councils. This included the following :

(1) **Adam and Eve were real human beings, the first parents of all mankind.** These names are not merely symbolic of mankind in general, or names given to some group of primitive ancestors.

(2) **The souls of Adam and Eve, like those of all human beings, were directly created by God.**

(3) **Original Sin was an actual sin committed by the individual Adam, and passed on to all the human race by generation (not by imitation).**

(4) **The Theory of Evolution (of the human body) has not been proved for certain.**

" Some thinkers are loud in their demand that the Catholic religion should make these sciences of the greatest possible account. An excellent principle, where it is a question of really ascertained facts; but what of hypotheses, based to some extent on natural science, which yet affect the doctrines enshrined in Scripture and in tradition ? Here we must be cautious; where such conjectures are directly or indirectly opposed to the truths God has revealed, the claim is inadmissible."

(5) **"Thus, the Teaching of the Church leaves the doctrine of Evolution an open question, as long as it confines its speculations to the development, from other living matter already in existence, of the human body."**

(6) **The first eleven chapters of Genesis are real history, and must not be put on a level with mere myths or legends.**